

Dear Bud,

11/19/74

Yesterday you mailed me the first page and the first 4 grafts of the second page of a letter your attached notes describes as "from an ex-FBI man." Your reason was because this might interest me.

It does. I presume the source is Murtagh. What interests me is the meaningless generality and the absence of specifics he can provide, given the disposition.

Unless there is a brave new informational world in what you cut of he's said much more, and much more impressively (and less self-servingly) on TV.

The record persuades that there is no purpose to be gained by giving you cautions but this gibberish prompts the unwelcome suggestion again.

There is no substitute for factual knowledge in making this kind of evaluation. There is factual information he could have supplied instead of some of the misleading generalities, where he is careful to label it as opinion. Some, for example, is what your erstwhile creny (against whom I did also caution you) fucked up several years ago, at an inspiration I can't specify and don't pretend to. But because you found it inappropriate to describe what you deemed it necessary to withhold by scissors I have no way of carrying this further and under the circumstances no disposition to take the writing time. However, if you want more and he didn't give it I'm again going under the belief this is Murtagh - he was part of the (anti) King operation, at least in Atlanta. Perhaps it is in earlier correspondence you have deemed it inadvisable to share with me. But there is much more this man knows, including about anti-King surveillance.

Another caution: watch these guys who get to retirement age before they develop pangs of conscience. They engage in self-justification and at the least from it exaggerate. Example: only the delts didn't know what was going on or what they were part of. They knew. Some have discussed it with me. Others quit over it.

The opinions he expresses here, which do not seem to be precisely these I've heard him express in the past, are open to question once he gets beyond general knowledge. His guidance seems to me to be in the least likely direction. And four phoned interruptions in two hours discourages carrying this further. If you'd like to discuss it, fine. I'll take time.

And when he went for Bob's craziness and declined even to acknowledge my specific questions I ^{find} ~~find~~ no reassurance. I think I asked him specific questions and I know I got no acknowledgement and he did take the initiative with Bob.

Are you not concerned that he refers to "the system" but not to the saint?

Sincerely,



Law Office
FENSTERWALD & OHLHAUSEN
905 16TH STREET, N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20006



Mr. Harold Weisberg
Rents 8
Frederick
Md.